Gaussian Multiple Access Channels with One-Bit Quantizer at the Receiver

Borzoo Rassouli, Morteza Varasteh and Deniz Gündüz

arXiv:1703.02324v1 [cs.IT] 7 Mar 2017

Abstract

The capacity region of a two-transmitter Gaussian multiple access channel (MAC) under average input power constraints is studied, when the receiver employs a zero-threshold one-bit analog-to-digital converter (ADC). It is proved that the input distributions of the two transmitters that achieve the boundary points of the capacity region are discrete. Based on the position of a boundary point, upper bounds on the number of the mass points of the corresponding distributions are derived. Furthermore, a closed-form solution for the sum capacity of this channel is derived, and it is shown that time division with power control achieves it. Finally, a conjecture on the sufficiency of K mass points in a point-to-point real AWGN with a K-bin ADC front end at the receiver (symmetric or asymmetric) is also settled.

Index Terms

Gaussian multiple access channel, one-bit quantizer, capacity region, sum capacity.

I. Introduction

The energy consumption of an analog-to-digital converter (ADC) (measured in Joules/sample) grows exponentially with its resolution (in bits/sample) [1], [2]. When the available power is limited, for example, for mobile devices with limited battery capacity, or for wireless receivers that operate on limited energy harvested from ambient sources [3], the receiver circuitry may be constrained to operate with low resolution ADCs. The presence of a low-resolution ADC, in particular a one-bit ADC at the receiver, alters the channel characteristics significantly. Such a constraint not only limits the fundamental bounds on the achievable rate, but it also changes the nature of the communication and modulation schemes approaching these bounds. For example, in a real additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channel under an average power constraint on the input, if the receiver is equipped with a K-bin (i.e., $\log_2 K$-bit) ADC front end, it is shown in [4] that the capacity-achieving input distribution is discrete with at most $K+1$ mass points[1]. This is in contrast with the optimality of the Gaussian input distribution when the receiver has infinite resolution.

Borzoo Rassouli, Morteza Varasteh and Deniz Gündüz are with the Intelligent Systems and Networks group of Department of Electrical and Electronics, Imperial College London, United Kingdom. emails: {b.rassouli12, m.varasteh12, d.gunduz}@imperial.ac.uk.

[1]We further tighten this to K mass points in this paper.

Especially with the adoption of massive multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) receivers and the millimeter wave (mmWave) technology enabling communication over large bandwidths, communication systems with limited-resolution receiver front ends are becoming of practical importance. Accordingly, there have been a growing research interest in understanding both the fundamental information theoretic limits and the design of practical communication protocols for systems with finite-resolution ADC front ends. In [5], the authors show that for a Rayleigh fading channel with a one-bit ADC and perfect channel state information at the receiver (CSIR), quadrature phase shift keying (QPSK) modulation is capacity-achieving. In case of no CSIR, [6] shows that (QPSK) modulation is optimal when the signal-to-noise (SNR) ratio is above a certain threshold, which depends on the coherence time of the channel, while for SNRs below this threshold, on-off QPSK achieves the capacity. For the point-to-point multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) channel with a one-bit ADC front end at each receive antenna and perfect CSIR, [7] shows that QPSK is optimal at very low SNRs, while with perfect channel state information at the transmitter (CSIT), upper and lower bounds on the capacity are provided in [8].

To the best of our knowledge, the existing literature on communications with low-resolution ADCs focus exclusively on point-to-point systems. Our goal in this paper is to understand the impact of low-resolution ADCs on the capacity region of a multiple access channel (MAC). In particular, we consider a two-transmitter Gaussian MAC with a one-bit quantizer at the receiver. The inputs to the channel are subject to average power constraints. We show that any point on the boundary of the capacity region is achieved by discrete input distributions. Based on the slope of the tangent line to the capacity region at a boundary point, we propose upper bounds on the cardinality of the support of these distributions. Then, we focus on the sum capacity of this channel, we derive a closed-form sum capacity expression, and show that it achieved by time division with power control. As a side result of the optimization trick we employ to obtain the cardinality of the input distributions, we also resolve an open problem for a real point-to-point AWGN channel with a K-bin ADC front end (symmetric or asymmetric). We show that a discrete input distribution with at most K mass points is sufficient to achieve the point-to-point capacity.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces the system model. In Section III, the capacity region of a general two-transmitter memoryless MAC under input average power constraints is investigated. Through an example, it is shown that when there is input average power constraint, it is necessary to consider the capacity region with the auxiliary random variable U in general. The main result of the paper is presented in Section III, and a detailed proof is given in Section IV. Sum capacity analysis is provided in Section V. Finally, Section VI concludes the paper.

Notations. Random variables are denoted by capital letters, while their realizations with lower case letters. $F_X(x)$ denotes the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of random variable X. The conditional probability mass function (pmf) $p_{Y|X_1,X_2}(y|x_1,x_2)$ will be written as $p(y|x_1,x_2)$. For integers $m \leq n$, we have $[m:n] = \{m, m+1, \ldots, n\}$. For $0 \leq t \leq 1$, $H_b(t) \triangleq -t\log_2 t - (1-t)\log_2(1-t)$ denotes the binary entropy function. The unit-step function is denoted by $s(\cdot)$.



Fig. 1: A two-transmitter Gaussian MAC with a one-bit ADC front end at the receiver.

II. System model and preliminaries

We consider a two-transmitter memoryless Gaussian MAC (as shown in Figure 1) with a one-bit quantizer Γ at the receiver front end. Transmitter $j = 1, 2$ encodes its message W_j into a codeword X_j^n and transmits it over the shared channel. The signal received by the decoder is given by

$$Y^n = \Gamma(X_1^n + X_2^n + Z^n),$$

where $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) Gaussian noise process, also independent of the channel inputs X_1^n and X_2^n with $Z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1), i \in [1 : n]$. Γ represents the one-bit ADC operation given by

$$\Gamma(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \geq 0 \\ 0 & x < 0 \end{cases}.$$

This channel can be modelled by the triplet $(\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2, p(y|x_1, x_2), \mathcal{Y})$, where $\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2$ $(= \mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ $(= \{0, 1\})$, respectively, are the alphabets of the inputs and the output. The conditional pmf of the channel output Y conditioned on the channel inputs X_1 and X_2 (i.e. $p(y|x_1, x_2)$) is characterized by

$$p(0|x_1, x_2) = 1 - p(1|x_1, x_2) = Q(x_1 + x_2), \tag{1}$$

where $Q(x) \triangleq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_x^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt$.

Upon receiving the sequence Y^n, the decoder finds the estimates $(\hat{W}_1, \hat{W}_2)$ of the messages.

A $(2^{nR_1}, 2^{nR_2}, n)$ code for this channel consists of (as in [9]):

- two message sets $[1 : 2^{nR_1}]$ and $[1 : 2^{nR_2}]$,
- two encoders, where encoder $j = 1, 2$ assigns a codeword $x_j^n(w_j)$ to each message $w_j \in [1 : 2^{nR_j}]$, and
- a decoder that assigns estimates $(\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2) \in [1 : 2^{nR_1}] \times [1 : 2^{nR_2}]$ or an error message to each received sequence y^n.

We assume that the message pair (W_1, W_2) is uniformly distributed over $[1 : 2^{nR_1}] \times [1 : 2^{nR_2}]$. The average probability of error is defined as

$$P_e^{(n)} = \Pr\left\{(\hat{W}_1, \hat{W}_2) \neq (W_1, W_2)\right\} \tag{2}$$

Average power constraints are imposed on the channel inputs as

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{j,i}^2(w_j) \leq P_j \ , \ \forall m_j \in [1:2^{nR_j}], j \in \{1,2\},$$

where $x_{j,i}(w_j)$ denotes the i^{th} element of the codeword $x_j^n(w_j)$.

A rate pair (R_1, R_2) is said to be *achievable* for this channel if there exists a sequence of $(2^{nR_1}, 2^{nR_2}, n)$ codes (satisfying the average power constraints) such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} P_e^{(n)} = 0$. The *capacity region* $\mathscr{C}(P_1, P_2)$ of this channel is the closure of the set of achievable rate pairs (R_1, R_2).

III. Main results

Proposition 1. The capacity region $\mathscr{C}(P_1, P_2)$ of a two-transmitter memoryless MAC with average power constraints P_1 and P_2 is the set of non-negative rate pairs (R_1, R_2) that satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &\leq I(X_1; Y|X_2, U), \\ R_2 &\leq I(X_2; Y|X_1, U), \\ R_1 + R_2 &\leq I(X_1, X_2; Y|U), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

for some $F_U(u)F_{X_1|U}(x_1|u)F_{X_2|U}(x_2|u)$, such that $\mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \leq P_j, \ j = 1, 2$. Also, it is sufficient to consider $|\mathcal{U}| \leq 5$. It is obvious that for a fixed joint distribution $F_U(u)F_{X_1|U}(x_1|u)F_{X_2|U}(x_2|u)$, the region in (3) is a pentagon.

Proof. The capacity region of the discrete memoryless (DM) MAC with input cost constraints has been addressed in Exercise 4.8 of [9]. If the input alphabets are not discrete, the capacity region is still the same because: 1) the converse remains the same if the inputs are from a continuous alphabet; 2) the region is achievable by coded time sharing and the discretization procedure (see Remark 3.8 in [9]). Therefore, it is sufficient to show the cardinality bound $|U| \leq 5$.

Let $\mathscr{P}$ be the set of all product distributions (i.e., of the form $F_{X_1}(x_1)F_{X_2}(x_2)$) on $\mathbb{R}^2$. Let $\mathbf{g} : \mathscr{P} \to \mathbb{R}^5$ be a vector-valued mapping defined element-wise as

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(F_{X_1}(x_1|u)F_{X_2}(x_2|u)) &= I(X_1; Y|X_2, U = u), \\ g_2(F_{X_1}(x_1|u)F_{X_2}(x_2|u)) &= I(X_2; Y|X_1, U = u), \\ g_3(F_{X_1}(x_1|u)F_{X_2}(x_2|u)) &= I(X_1, X_2; Y|U = u), \\ g_4(F_{X_1}(x_1|u)F_{X_2}(x_2|u)) &= \mathbb{E}[X_1^2|u], \\ g_5(F_{X_1}(x_1|u)F_{X_2}(x_2|u)) &= \mathbb{E}[X_2^2|u]. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Let $\mathscr{G} \subset \mathbb{R}^5$ be the image of $\mathscr{P}$ under the mapping $\mathbf{g}$ (i.e., $\mathscr{G} = \mathbf{g}(\mathscr{P})$). Note that although $\mathbf{g}$ is a continuous mapping, $\mathscr{G}$ is not necessarily compact[2] (since g_4, g_5 cannot be bounded). Given an arbitrary $(U, X_1, X_2) \sim$

[2]Note that compactness is not a necessary condition here, as stated in the footnote on page 267 of [10].

$F_U F_{X_1|U} F_{X_2|U}$, we obtain the vector $\mathbf{r}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
r_1 &= I(X_1;Y|X_2,U) = \int_{\mathcal{U}} I(X_1;Y|X_2,U=u)dF_U(u),\\
r_2 &= I(X_2;Y|X_1,U) = \int_{\mathcal{U}} I(X_2;Y|X_1,U=u)dF_U(u),\\
r_3 &= I(X_1,X_2;Y|U) = \int_{\mathcal{U}} I(X_1,X_2;Y|U=u)dF_U(u),\\
r_4 &= \mathbb{E}[X_1^2] = \int_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbb{E}[X_1^2|u]dF_U(u),\\
r_5 &= \mathbb{E}[X_2^2] = \int_{\mathcal{U}} \mathbb{E}[X_2^2|u]dF_U(u).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\mathbf{r}$ is in the convex hull of $\mathscr{G} \subset \mathbb{R}^5$. By Carathéodory's theorem [10], $\mathbf{r}$ is a convex combination of 6 $(= 5+1)$ or fewer points in $\mathscr{G}$, which states that it is sufficient to consider $|\mathcal{U}| \leq 6$. Since $\mathscr{P}$ is a connected set and the mapping $\mathbf{g}$ is continuous, $\mathscr{G}$ is a connected subset of $\mathbb{R}^5$. Therefore, connectedness of $\mathscr{G}$ refines the cardinality of U to $|\mathcal{U}| \leq 5$. □

Lemma 1. For the boundary points of $\mathscr{C}(P_1,P_2)$ that are not sum-rate optimal, it is sufficient to have $|\mathcal{U}| \leq 4$.

Proof. Any point on the boundary of the capacity region that does not maximize R_1+R_2, is either of the form $(I(X_1;Y|X_2,U), I(X_2;Y|U))$ or $(I(X_1;Y|U), I(X_2;Y|X_1,U))$ for some $F_U F_{X_1|U} F_{X_2|U}$ that satisfies $\mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \leq P_j, j=1,2$. In other words, it is one of the corner points of the corresponding pentagon in (3). As in the proof of Proposition 1, define the mapping $\mathbf{g}: \mathscr{P} \to \mathbb{R}^4$, where g_1 and g_2 are the coordinates of this boundary point conditioned on $U=u$, and g_3, g_4 are the same as g_4 and g_5 in (4), respectively. The sufficiency of $|\mathcal{U}| \leq 4$ in this case follows similarly to the proof of Proposition 1. □

When there is no input cost constraint, the capacity region of the MAC can be characterized either through the convex hull operation as in [9, Theorem 4.2], or with the introduction of an auxiliary random variable as in [9, Theorem 4.3]. The following remark states that when there is an input cost constraint, the capacity region has only the computable characterization with the auxiliary random variable.

Remark 2. Let $(X_1,X_2) \sim F_{X_1}(x_1)F_{X_2}(x_2)$ such that $\mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \leq P_j, j=1,2$. Let $\mathscr{R}(P_1,P_2)$ denote the set of non-negative rate pairs (R_1,R_2) such that

$$\begin{aligned}
R_1 &\leq I(X_1;Y|X_2),\\
R_2 &\leq I(X_2;Y|X_1),\\
R_1+R_2 &\leq I(X_1,X_2;Y).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathscr{R}_1(P_1,P_2)$ be the convex closure of $\bigcup_{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}} \mathscr{R}(P_1,P_2)$, where the union is over all product distributions that satisfy the average power constraints.

Let $\mathscr{R}_2(P_1,P_2)$ be the set of non-negative rate pairs (R_1,R_2) such that

$$R_1 \leq I(X_1;Y|X_2,U),$$

$$R_2 \leq I(X_2;Y|X_1,U),$$

$$R_1+R_2 \leq I(X_1,X_2;Y|U)$$

for some $F_U(u)F_{X_1|U}(x_1|u)F_{X_2|U}(x_2|u)$ that satisfies $\mathbb{E}[X_j^2|u] \leq P_j, j=1,2,\ \forall u$.

It can be verified that $\mathscr{R}_1(P_1,P_2)=\mathscr{R}_2(P_1,P_2)$. By comparing $\mathscr{R}_2(P_1,P_2)$ to the capacity region $\mathscr{C}(P_1,P_2)$, we can conclude that $\mathscr{R}_2(P_1,P_2) \subseteq \mathscr{C}(P_1,P_2)$. This follows from the fact that in the region $\mathscr{R}_2(P_1,P_2)$, the average power constraint $\mathbb{E}[X_j^2|u] \leq P_j$ holds for every realization of the auxiliary random variable U, which is a stronger condition than $\mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \leq P_j$ used in the capacity region. The following example shows that $\mathscr{R}_1(P_1,P_2)$ and $\mathscr{R}_2(P_1,P_2)$ can be strictly smaller than $\mathscr{C}(P_1,P_2)$.

Consider the same Gaussian MAC with one-bit quantizer at the receiver (as depicted in Figure 1) with the following changes: i) $\mathcal{X}_1=\mathcal{X}_2=\{-\sqrt{2},0,\sqrt{2}\}$, ii) Besides the average power constraints of $P_1=P_2=1$, we also impose the constraint that the inputs should have a zero mean, i.e. $\mathbb{E}[X_j]=0,\ j=1,2$. The capacity region of this channel is the set of non-negative rate pairs (R_1,R_2) such that (3) holds for some $F_U(u)F_{X_1|U}(x_1|u)F_{X_2|U}(x_2|u)$ which satisfies $\mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \leq P_j,\ \mathbb{E}[X_j]=0,\ j=1,2$. Also, let $\mathscr{R}_1$ be the rate region in Remark 2 with the additional constraints $\mathbb{E}[X_j]=0,\ j=1,2$.

In order to show that $\mathscr{R}_1$ can be strictly smaller than the capacity region, we show that there exists a point in the capacity region which is not in $\mathscr{R}_1$. We have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{(R_1,R_2)\in\mathscr{R}_1} R_1+R_2 &= \max_{\substack{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}:\\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2]\leq 1,\mathbb{E}[X_j]=0,\ j=1,2}} I(X_1,X_2;Y) \\
&= \max_{\substack{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}:\\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2]\leq 1,\mathbb{E}[X_j]=0,\ j=1,2}} I(X_1+X_2;Y) \qquad (5)\\
&\leq \max_{\substack{F_X(x):\\ \mathbb{E}[X^2]\leq 2,\mathbb{E}[X]=0}} I(X;Y) \qquad (6)\\
&\leq \max_{\substack{F_X(x):\\ \mathbb{E}[X^2]\leq 2}} I(X;Y) \\
&= 1-H_b(Q(\sqrt{2})) \qquad (7)\\
&\leq \max_{\substack{F_U F_{X_1|U} F_{X_2|U}:\\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2]\leq 1,\mathbb{E}[X_j]=0,\ j=1,2}} I(X_1,X_2;Y|U) \qquad (8)\\
&= \max_{(R_1,R_2)\in\mathscr{C}} R_1+R_2,
\end{aligned}$$

where (5) is due to the fact that X_1+X_2 is a function of the pair (X_1,X_2), and the following Markov chain holds: $(X_1,X_2) \to X_1+X_2 \to Y$. In (6), we use the inequality $\mathbb{E}[(X_1+X_2)^2]=\mathbb{E}[X_1^2]+\mathbb{E}[X_2^2] \leq 2$, since X_1 and X_2 are independent and zero mean. Also, the channel from X to Y is characterized by the conditional distribution $p_{Y|X}(y|x) \sim \text{Bern}(Q(x))$. (7) is due to [4], where the maximum is shown to be achieved by the CDF



Fig. 2: The distributions of X^* and $\tilde{X}$.

$F_X^*(x) = \frac{1}{2}s(x+\sqrt{2}) + \frac{1}{2}s(x-\sqrt{2})$, where $s(\cdot)$ is the unit step function. Let $U \sim \text{Bern}(\frac{1}{2})$, $F_{X_1|U}(x|1) = F_{X_2|U}(x|0) = \frac{1}{2}s(x+\sqrt{2}) + \frac{1}{2}s(x-\sqrt{2})$ and $F_{X_1|U}(x|0) = F_{X_2|U}(x|1) = s(x)$. For this joint distribution on (U, X_1, X_2), we have $\mathbb{E}[X_j] = 0,\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \le 1,\ j = 1, 2$ and $I(X_1, X_2; Y|U) = 1 - H_b(Q(\sqrt{2}))$, which results in (8).

In what follows, it is proved that the inequality in (6) is strict. In other words, the sum rate of $1 - H_b(Q(\sqrt{2}))$ cannot be obtained by any rate pair in $\mathscr{R}_1$, while it is in the capacity region. Let $\tilde{X} = X_1 + X_2$, where X_1 and X_2 are two zero-mean independent random variables on $\mathcal{X}_1 (= \mathcal{X}_2)$ satisfying the average power constraint $\mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \le 1, j = 1, 2$. We show that the minimum Lévy distance[3] between $F_X^*(x)$ and all the distributions $F_{\tilde{X}}(x)$ (induced by $F_{X_1}F_{X_2}$) is bounded away from zero. Since $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[X^2] \le 1$, the distribution of X_1 is $F_{X_1}(x) = ps(x+\sqrt{2}) + (1-p)s(x) + ps(x-\sqrt{2})$ with $p \le \frac{1}{4}$. The same applies to F_{X_2} with parameter $p' (\le \frac{1}{4})$. The distribution of $\tilde{X}$ induced by $F_{X_1}F_{X_2}$ is given by

$$F_{\tilde{X}}(x) = pp's(x+2\sqrt{2}) + p*p's(x+\sqrt{2}) + (1-2(pp'+p*p'))\,s(x) + p*p's(x-\sqrt{2}) + pp's(x-2\sqrt{2}),$$

where $p*p' \triangleq p(1-p') + p'(1-p)$ denotes the binary convolution operation. Let $\tilde{\mathscr{F}}$ be the set of all distributions on $\tilde{X}$ obtained in this way. It can be easily verified that (see Figure 2) for any given $p, p' \le \frac{1}{4}$, the Lévy distance between $F_{\tilde{X}}$ and F_X^* is

$$d_L(F_{\tilde{X}}, F_X^*) = \max\{pp', \frac{1}{2} - pp' - p*p'\} = \frac{1}{2} - pp' - p*p'. \tag{9}$$

Subseuuently,

$$\min_{p,p' \le \frac{1}{4}} d_L(F_{\tilde{X}}, F_X^*) = \frac{1}{16}.$$

[3]The Lévy distance between two distributions $F, G : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1]$ is defined as

$$d_L(F, G) = \inf\{\epsilon > 0 | F(x-\epsilon) - \epsilon \le G(x) \le F(x+\epsilon) + \epsilon,\ \forall x \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

This shows that there is a neighborhood of F_X^* whose intersection with $\tilde{\mathscr{F}}$ is empty. Note that any neighborhood with radius less than $\frac{1}{16}$ has this property. Combined with the facts that the mutual information is continuous and F_X^* is the unique solution, it proves that the inequality in (6) is strict. Therefore, $\mathscr{R}_1$ $(= \mathscr{R}_2)$ is smaller than the capacity region in general.

The main result of this paper is provided in the following theorem. It bounds the cardinality of the support set of the capacity achieving distributions.

Theorem 1. Let P be an arbitrary point on the boundary of the capacity region $\mathscr{C}(P_1, P_2)$ of the memoryless MAC with a one-bit ADC front end[4] (as shown in Figure 1) achieved by $F_U^P(u)F_{X_1|U}^P(x_1|u)F_{X_2|U}^P(x_2|u)$. Let l_P be the slope of the line tangent to the capacity region at this point. For any $u \in \mathcal{U}$, the conditional input distributions $F_{X_1|U}^P(x_1|u)$ and $F_{X_1|U}^P(x_1|u)$ have at most n_1 and n_2 points of increase[5], respectively, where

$$(n_1, n_2) = \begin{cases} (2,3) & l_p < -1 \\ (2,2) & l_p = -1 \\ (3,2) & l_p > -1 \end{cases}. \tag{10}$$

Proof. The proof is provided in Section IV. □

Proposition 1, Lemma 1 and Theorem 1 establish upper bounds on the number of mass points of the distributions that achieve a boundary point. The significance of this result is that once it is known that the optimal inputs are discrete with at most certain number of mass points, the capacity region along with the optimal distributions can be obtained via computer programs.

IV. Proof of theorem 1

Since the capacity region is a convex space, it can be characterized by its supporting hyperplanes. In other words, any point on the boundary of the capacity region, denoted by (R_1^b, R_2^b), can be written as

$$(R_1^b, R_2^b) = \arg \max_{(R_1,R_2)\in\mathscr{C}(P_1,P_2)} R_1 + \lambda R_2,$$

for some $\lambda > 0$.

Any rate pair $(R_1, R_2) \in \mathscr{C}(P_1, P_2)$ must lie within a pentagon defined by (3) for some $F_U F_{X_1|U} F_{X_2|U}$ that satisfies the power constraints. Therefore, due to the structure of the pentagon, the problem of finding the boundary points is equivalent to the following maximization problem.

$$\max_{(R_1,R_2)\in\mathscr{C}(P_1,P_2)} R_1 + \lambda R_2 = \begin{cases} \max I(X_1; Y|X_2, U) + \lambda I(X_2; Y|U) & 0 < \lambda \leq 1 \\ \max I(X_2; Y|X_1, U) + \lambda I(X_1; Y|U) & \lambda > 1 \end{cases}, \tag{11}$$

where on the right hand side (RHS) of (11), the maximizations are over all $F_U F_{X_1|U} F_{X_2|U}$ that satisfy the power constraints. It is obvious that when $\lambda = 1$, the two lines in (11) are the same, which results in the sum capacity.

[4]The results remain valid if the one-bit ADC has a non-zero threshold.

[5]A point Z is said to be a point of increase of a distribution if for any open set Ω containing Z, we have $\Pr\{\Omega\} > 0$.

For any product of distributions $F_{X_1}F_{X_2}$ and the channel in (1), let I_λ be defined as

$$I_\lambda(F_{X_1}F_{X_2}) = \begin{cases} I(X_1;Y|X_2) + \lambda I(X_2;Y) & 0 < \lambda \leq 1 \\ I(X_2;Y|X_1) + \lambda I(X_1;Y) & \lambda > 1 \end{cases}. \tag{12}$$

With this definition, (11) can be written as

$$\max_{(R_1,R_2)\in\mathscr{C}(P_1,P_2)} R_1 + \lambda R_2 = \max \sum_{i=1}^{5} p_U(u_i) I_\lambda(F_{X_1|U}(x_1|u_i)F_{X_2|U}(x_2|u_i)),$$

where the maximization is over product distributions of the form $p_U(u)F_{X_1|U}(x_1|u)F_{X_2|U}(x_2|u),\ |\mathcal{U}| \leq 5$, such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{5} p_U(u_i)\mathbb{E}[X_j^2|u_i] \leq P_j,\ j = 1, 2.$$

Proposition 2. For a given F_{X_1} and any $\lambda > 0$, $I_\lambda(F_{X_1}F_{X_2})$ is a concave, continuous and weakly differentiable function of F_{X_2}. In the statement of this Proposition, F_{X_1} and F_{X_2} could be interchanged.

Proof. The proof is provided in Appendix A. □

Proposition 3. Let P_1', P_2' be two arbitrary non-negative real numbers. For the following problem

$$\max_{\substack{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}: \\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2]\leq P_j',\ j=1,2}} I_\lambda(F_{X_1}F_{X_2}), \tag{13}$$

the optimal inputs $F_{X_1}^*$ and $F_{X_2}^*$, which are not unique in general, have the following properties,

(i) The support sets of $F_{X_1}^*$ and $F_{X_2}^*$ are bounded subsets of $\mathbb{R}$.

(ii) $F_{X_1}^*$ and $F_{X_2}^*$ are discrete distributions that have at most n_1 and n_2 points of increase, respectively, where

$$(n_1, n_2) = \begin{cases} (3,2) & 0 < \lambda < 1 \\ (2,2) & \lambda = 1 \\ (2,3) & \lambda > 1 \end{cases}.$$

Proof. We start with the proof of the first claim. Assume that $0 < \lambda \leq 1$, and F_{X_2} is given. Consider the following optimization problem:

$$I_{F_{X_2}}^* \triangleq \sup_{\substack{F_{X_1}: \\ \mathbb{E}[X_1^2]\leq P_1'}} I_\lambda(F_{X_1}F_{X_2}). \tag{14}$$

Note that $I_{F_{X_2}}^* < +\infty$, since for any $\lambda > 0$, from (12),

$$I_\lambda \leq (\lambda + 1)H(Y) \leq (1 + \lambda) < +\infty.$$

From Proposition 2, I_λ is a continuous, concave function of F_{X_1}. Also, the set of all CDFs with bounded second moment (here, P_1') is convex and compact[6]. Therefore, the supremum in (14) is achieved by a unique distribution $F_{X_1}^*$. Since for any $F_{X_1}(x) = s(x - x_0)$ with $|x_0|^2 < P_1'$, we have $\mathbb{E}[X_1^2] < P_1'$, the Lagrangian theorem and the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions state that there exists a $\theta_1 \geq 0$ such that

$$I_{F_{X_2}}^* = \sup_{F_{X_1}} \left\{ I_\lambda(F_{X_1}F_{X_2}) - \theta_1 \left(\int x^2 dF_{X_1}(x) - P_1' \right) \right\}. \tag{15}$$

[6]The compactness follows from [11, Appendix I].

Furthermore, the supremum in (15) is achieved by $F_{X_1}^*$, and

$$\theta_1 \left(\int x^2 dF_{X_1}^*(x) - P_1' \right) = 0. \tag{16}$$

Lemma 2. The Lagrangian multiplier θ_1 is nonzero.

Proof. Having a zero Lagrangian multiplier means the power constraint is inactive. In other words, if $\theta_1 = 0$, (14) and (15) imply that

$$\sup_{\substack{F_{X_1} \\ \mathbb{E}[X_1^2] \le P_1'}} I_\lambda(F_{X_1} F_{X_2}) = \sup_{F_{X_1}} I_\lambda(F_{X_1} F_{X_2}). \tag{17}$$

We prove that (17) does not hold by showing that its left hand side (LHS) is strictly lower than 1, while its RHS equals 1. The details are provided in Appendix B. □

$I_\lambda(F_{X_1} F_{X_2})$ $(0 < \lambda \le 1)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} I_\lambda(F_{X_1} F_{X_2}) &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \sum_{y=0}^{1} p(y|x_1, x_2) \log \frac{p(y|x_1, x_2)}{[p(y; F_{X_1} F_{X_2})]^\lambda [p(y; F_{X_1}|x_2)]^{1-\lambda}} dF_{X_1}(x_1) dF_{X_2}(x_2) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \tilde{i}_\lambda(x_1; F_{X_1}|F_{X_2}) dF_{X_1}(x_1) \qquad (18) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} i_\lambda(x_2; F_{X_2}|F_{X_1}) dF_{X_2}(x_2), \qquad (19) \end{aligned}$$

where we have defined

$$\tilde{i}_\lambda(x_1; F_{X_1}|F_{X_2}) \triangleq \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left(D\left(p(y|x_1, x_2) || p(y; F_{X_1} F_{X_2})\right) + (1-\lambda) \sum_{y=0}^{1} p(y|x_1, x_2) \log \frac{p(y; F_{X_1} F_{X_2})}{p(y; F_{X_1}|x_2)} \right) dF_{X_2}(x_2), \tag{20}$$

and

$$i_\lambda(x_2; F_{X_2}|F_{X_1}) \triangleq \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} D\left(p(y|x_1, x_2) || p(y; F_{X_1} F_{X_2})\right) dF_{X_1}(x_1) - (1-\lambda) D\left(p(y; F_{X_1}|x_2) || p(y; F_{X_1} F_{X_2})\right). \tag{21}$$

$p(y; F_{X_1} F_{X_2})$ is nothing but the pmf of Y with the emphasis that it has been induced by F_{X_1} and F_{X_2}. Likewise, $p(y; F_{X_1}|x_2)$ is the conditional pmf $p(y|x_2)$ when X_1 is drawn according to F_{X_1}. From (18), $\tilde{i}_\lambda(x_1; F_{X_1}|F_{X_2})$ can be considered as the density of I_λ over F_{X_1} when F_{X_2} is given. $i_\lambda(x_2; F_{X_2}|F_{X_1})$ can be interpreted in a similar way.

Note that (15) is an unconstrained optimization problem over the set of all CDFs. Since $\int x^2 dF_{X_1}(x)$ is linear and weakly differentiable in F_{X_1}, the objective function in (15) is strictly concave and weakly differentiable. Hence, a necessary condition for optimality of $F_{X_1}^*$ is

$$\int \{\tilde{i}_\lambda(x_1; F_{X_1}^*|F_{X_2}) + \theta_1(P_1' - x_1^2)\} dF_{X_1}(x_1) \le I_{F_{X_2}}^*, \quad \forall F_{X_1}. \tag{22}$$

Furthermore, (22) can be verified to be equivalent to

$$\tilde{i}_\lambda(x_1; F_{X_1}^*|F_{X_2}) + \theta_1(P_1' - x_1^2) \le I_{F_{X_2}}^*, \quad \forall x_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{23}$$

with equality if and only if x_1 is a point of increase of $F_{X_1}^*$.

In what follows, we prove that in order to satisfy (23), $F^*_{X_1}$ must have a bounded support by showing that the LHS of (23) goes to $-\infty$ with x_1. The following lemma is useful in the seuuel for taking the limit processes inside the integrals.

Lemma 3. Let X_1 and X_2 be two independent random variables satisfying $\mathbb{E}[X_1^2] \leq P_1'$ and $\mathbb{E}[X_2^2] \leq P_2'$, respectively ($P_1', P_2' \in [0, +\infty)$). Considering the conditional pmf in (1), the following inequalities hold.

$$\left| D\left(p(y|x_1,x_2)||p(y;F_{X_1}F_{X_2})\right) \right| \leq 1 - 2\log Q(\sqrt{P_1'} + \sqrt{P_2'}) \tag{24}$$

$$p(y;F_{X_1}|x_2) \geq Q\left(\sqrt{P_1'} + |x_2|\right) \tag{25}$$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left| \sum_{y=0}^{1} p(y|x_1,x_2) \log \frac{p(y;F_{X_1}F_{X_2})}{p(y;F_{X_1}|x_2)} \right| dF_{X_2}(x_2) \leq -2\log Q\left(\sqrt{P_1'} + \sqrt{P_2'}\right) \tag{26}$$

Proof. The proof is provided in Appendix C. □

Note that

$$\lim_{x_1\to+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} D\left(p(y|x_1,x_2)||p(y;F^*_{X_1}F_{X_2})\right) dF_{X_2}(x_2) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \lim_{x_1\to+\infty} D\left(p(y|x_1,x_2)||p(y;F^*_{X_1}F_{X_2})\right) dF_{X_2}(x_2) \tag{27}$$

$$= -\log p_Y(1;F^*_{X_1}F_{X_2})$$

$$\leq -\log Q(\sqrt{P_1'} + \sqrt{P_2'}), \tag{28}$$

where (27) is due to Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem [12] and (24), which permit the interchange of the limit and the integral; and (28) is obtained from (71) in Appendix C. Furthermore,

$$\lim_{x_1\to+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \sum_{y=0}^{1} p(y|x_1,x_2) \log \frac{p(y;F^*_{X_1}F_{X_2})}{p(y;F^*_{X_1}|x_2)} dF_{X_2}(x_2) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \lim_{x_1\to+\infty} \sum_{y=0}^{1} p(y|x_1,x_2) \log \frac{p(y;F^*_{X_1}F_{X_2})}{p(y;F^*_{X_1}|x_2)} dF_{X_2}(x_2) \tag{29}$$

$$= \log p_Y(1;F^*_{X_1}F_{X_2}) - \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \log p(1;F^*_{X_1}|x_2) dF_{X_2}(x_2)$$

$$< -\log Q\left(\sqrt{P_1'} + \sqrt{P_2'}\right), \tag{30}$$

where (29) is due to Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem along with (26); (30) is from (25) and convexity of $\log Q(\alpha + \sqrt{t})$ in t when $\alpha \geq 0$ (see Appendix D).

Therefore, from (28) and (30),

$$\lim_{x_1\to+\infty} \tilde{i}_\lambda(x_1;F^*_{X_1}|F_{X_2}) \leq -(1+\lambda)\log Q(\sqrt{P_1'} + \sqrt{P_2'}) < +\infty. \tag{31}$$

Using a similar approach, we can also obtain

$$\lim_{x_1\to-\infty} \tilde{i}_\lambda(x_1;F^*_{X_1}|F_{X_2}) \leq -(1+\lambda)\log Q(\sqrt{P_1'} + \sqrt{P_2'}) < +\infty. \tag{32}$$

From (31), (32) and the fact that $\theta_1 > 0$ (see Lemma 2), the left hand side of (23) goes to $-\infty$ when $|x_1| \to +\infty$. Since any point of increase of $F^*_{X_1}$ must satisfy (23) with equality, and $I^*_{F_{X_2}} \geq 0$, it is proved that $F^*_{X_1}$ has a bounded support, i.e., $X_1 \in [A_1, A_2]$ for some $A_1, A_2 \in \mathbb{R}$.[7]

[7]Note that A_1 and A_2 are determined by the choice of F_{X_2}.

Similarly, for a given F_{X_1}, the optimization problem

$$I^*_{F_{X_1}} = \sup_{\substack{F_{X_2}: \\ \mathbb{E}[X_2^2]\leq P_2'}} I_\lambda(F_{X_1}F_{X_2}),$$

boils down to the following necessary condition

$$i_\lambda(x_2; F^*_{X_2}|F_{X_1}) + \theta_2(P_2' - x_2^2) \leq I^*_{F_{X_1}}, \quad \forall x_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{33}$$

for the optimality of $F^*_{X_2}$, which holds with equality if and only if x_2 is a point of increase of $F^*_{X_2}$. However, there are two main differences between (33) and (23). First is the difference between i_λ and $\tilde{i}_\lambda$. Second is the fact that we do not claim θ_2 to be nonzero, since the approach used in Lemma 2 cannot be readily applied to θ_2. Nonetheless, the boundedness of the support of $F^*_{X_2}$ can be proved by inspecting the behaviour of the LHS of (33) when $|x_2| \to +\infty$.

It can be easily verified that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{x_2\to+\infty} i_\lambda(x_2; F^*_{X_2}|F_{X_1}) &= -\lambda \log p_Y(1; F_{X_1}F^*_{X_2}) \leq -\lambda \log Q(\sqrt{P_1'} + \sqrt{P_2'}), \\
\lim_{x_2\to-\infty} i_\lambda(x_2; F^*_{X_2}|F_{X_1}) &= -\lambda \log p_Y(0; F_{X_1}F^*_{X_2}) \leq -\lambda \log Q(\sqrt{P_1'} + \sqrt{P_2'})
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

If $\theta_2 > 0$, the LHS of (33) goes to $-\infty$ with $|x_2|$ which proves that X_2^* is bounded. For the case of $\theta_2 = 0$, we rely on the boundedness of X_1, and use the fact that i_λ approaches its limit in (34) from below. In other words, there is a real number K such that $i_\lambda(x_2; F^*_{X_2}|F_{X_1}) < -\lambda \log p_Y(1; F_{X_1}F^*_{X_2})$ when $x_2 > K$, and $i_\lambda(x_2; F^*_{X_2}|F_{X_1}) < -\lambda \log p_Y(0; F_{X_1}F^*_{X_2})$ when $x_2 < -K$. This establishes the boundedness of X_2^*. By rewriting i_λ, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
i_\lambda(x_2; F^*_{X_2}|F_{X_1}) &= -\lambda p(1; F_{X_1}|x_2) \log p_Y(1; F_{X_1}F^*_{X_2}) \\
&\quad - \int_{-A_1}^{A_2} H_b(Q(x_1+x_2))dF_{X_1}(x_1) + (1-\lambda) \underbrace{H(Y|X_2=x_2)}_{H_b\left(\int Q(x_1+x_2)dF_{X_1}(x_1)\right)} - \lambda \overbrace{p(0; F_{X_1}|x_2)}^{\int Q(x_1+x_2)dF_{X_1}(x_1)} \log p_Y(0; F_{X_1}F^*_{X_2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Note that without loss of generality, we have assumed $X_1 \in [-A_1, A_2]$, where A_1, A_2 are some non-negative real numbers. Also, we restrict our attention to $x_2 \to +\infty$, since the case $x_2 \to -\infty$ follows similarly. It is obvious that the first term in the right hand side of (35) approaches $-\lambda \log p_Y(1; F_{X_1}F^*_{X_2})$ from below when $x_2 \to +\infty$, since $p(1; F_{X_1}|x_2) \leq 1$. It is also obvious that the remaining terms go to zero when $x_2 \to +\infty$. Hence, it is sufficient to show that the second line of (35) approaches zero from below, which is proved by using the following lemma.

Lemma 4. Let X_1 be distributed on $[-A_1, A_2]$ according to $F_{X_1}(x_1)$. We have

$$\lim_{x_2\to+\infty} \frac{\int_{-A_1}^{A_2} H_b(Q(x_1+x_2))dF_{X_1}(x_1)}{H_b\left(\int_{-A_1}^{A_2} Q(x_1+x_2)dF_{X_1}(x_1)\right)} = 1. \tag{36}$$

Proof. The proof is provided in Appendix E. □

From (36), we can write

$$\int_{-A_1}^{A_2} H_b(Q(x_1+x_2))dF_{X_1}(x_1) = \gamma(x_2) H_b\left(\int_{-A_1}^{A_2} Q(x_1+x_2)dF_{X_1}(x_1)\right), \tag{37}$$

where $\gamma(x_2) \leq 1$ (due to concavity of $H_b(\cdot)$), and $\gamma(x_2) \to 1$ when $x_2 \to +\infty$ (due to (36)). Also, from the fact that $\lim_{x\to 0} \frac{H_b(x)}{cx} = +\infty$ $(c > 0)$, we have

$$H_b\left(\int_{-A_1}^{A_2} Q(x_1+x_2)dF_{X_1}(x_1)\right) = -\eta(x_2)\log p_Y(0; F_{X_1}F^*_{X_2}) \int_{-A_1}^{A_2} Q(x_1+x_2)dF_{X_1}(x_1), \tag{38}$$

where $\eta(x_2) > 0$ and $\eta(x_2) \to +\infty$ when $x_2 \to +\infty$. From (37) and (38), the second line of (35) becomes

$$\left(1-\gamma(x_2)+\frac{\lambda}{\eta(x_2)}-\lambda\right) \underbrace{\left(-\eta(x_2)\log p_Y(0; F_{X_1}F^*_{X_2}) \int_{-A_1}^{A_2} Q(x_1+x_2)dF_{X_1}(x_1)\right)}_{\geq 0}. \tag{39}$$

Since $\gamma(x_2) \to 1$ and $\eta(x_2) \to +\infty$ as $x_2 \to +\infty$, there exists a real number K such that $1-\gamma(x_2)+\frac{\lambda}{\eta(x_2)}-\lambda < 0$ when $x_2 > K$. Therefore, the second line of (35) approaches zero from below. This proves that X_2^* has a bounded support.

Remark 3. We remark here that the order of showing the boundedness of the supports is important. First, for a given F_{X_2} (not necessarily bounded), it is proved that $F^*_{X_1}$ is bounded. Then, for a given bounded F_{X_1}, it is shown that $F^*_{X_2}$ is also bounded. The order is reversed when $\lambda > 1$, and it follows the same steps as in the case of $\lambda \leq 1$. Therefore, it is omitted.

We next prove the second claim in Proposition 3. We assume that $0 < \lambda < 1$, and a bounded F_{X_1} is given. We already know that for a given bounded F_{X_1}, $F^*_{X_2}$ has a bounded support denoted by $[A_1, A_2]$. Therefore,

$$I^*_{F_{X_1}} = \sup_{F_{X_2}} \left\{ I_\lambda(F_{X_1}F_{X_2}) - \theta_2\left(\int x^2 dF_{X_2}(x) - P_2'\right)\right\} \tag{40}$$

$$= \sup_{F_{X_2}\in\mathscr{S}_2} \left\{ I_\lambda(F_{X_1}F_{X_2}) - \theta_2\left(\int x^2 dF_{X_2}(x) - P_2'\right)\right\}, \tag{41}$$

where $\mathscr{S}_2$ denotes the set of all probability distributions on the Borel sets of $[A_1, A_2]$. Let $p_0^* = p_Y(0; F_{X_1}F^*_{X_2})$ denote the probability of the event $Y = 0$, induced by $F^*_{X_2}$ and the given F_{X_1}. The set

$$\mathscr{F}_2 = \left\{ F_{X_2} \in \mathscr{S}_2 | \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p(0|x_2) dF_{X_2}(x_2) = p_0^* \right\} \tag{42}$$

is the intersection of $\mathscr{S}_2$ with one hyperplane[8]. We can write

$$I^*_{F_{X_1}} = \sup_{F_{X_2}\in\mathscr{F}_2} \left\{ I_\lambda(F_{X_1}F_{X_2}) - \theta_2\left(\int x^2 dF_{X_2}(x) - P_2'\right)\right\}. \tag{43}$$

Note that having $F_{X_2} \in \mathscr{F}_2$, the objective function in (43) becomes

$$\underbrace{\lambda H(Y)}_{\text{constant}} + \underbrace{(1-\lambda)H(Y|X_2) - H(Y|X_1,X_2) - \theta_2\left(\int x^2 dF_{X_2}(x) - P_2'\right)}_{\text{linear in } F_{X_2}}. \tag{44}$$

Since the linear part is continuous and $\mathscr{F}_2$ is compact, the objective function in (43) attains its maximum at an extreme point of $\mathscr{F}_2$, which, by Dubins' theorem, is a convex combination of at most two extreme points of $\mathscr{S}_2$. Since the extreme points of $\mathscr{S}_2$ are the CDFs having only one point of increase in $[A_1, A_2]$, we conclude that given any bounded F_{X_1}, $F^*_{X_2}$ has at most two mass points.

[8]Note that $\mathscr{S}_2$ is convex and compact.

Now, assume that an arbitrary F_{X_2} is given with at most two mass points denoted by $\{x_{2,i}\}_{i=1}^{2}$. It is already known that the support of $F_{X_1}^*$ is bounded, which is denoted by $[A_1', A_2']$. Let $\mathscr{S}_1$ denote the set of all probability distributions on the Borel sets of $[A_1', A_2']$. The set

$$\mathscr{F}_1 = \left\{ F_{X_1} \in \mathscr{S}_1 \middle| \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p(0|x_1, x_{2,j}) dF_{X_1}(x_1) = p(0; F_{X_1}^*|x_{2,j}),\ j \in [1:2] \right\}, \tag{45}$$

is the intersection of $\mathscr{S}_1$ with two hyperplanes. In a similar way,

$$I_{F_{X_2}}^* = \sup_{F_{X_1} \in \mathscr{F}_1} \left\{ I_\lambda(F_{X_1} F_{X_2}) - \theta_1 \left(\int x^2 dF_{X_1}(x) - P_1' \right) \right\}, \tag{46}$$

and having $F_{X_1} \in \mathscr{F}_1$, the objective function in (46) becomes

$$I_\lambda = \underbrace{\lambda H(Y) + (1-\lambda) \sum_{i=1}^{2} H(Y|X_2 = x_{2,i})}_{\text{constant}} - \underbrace{H(Y|X_1, X_2) - \theta_1 \left(\int x^2 dF_{X_1}(x) - P_1' \right)}_{\text{linear in } F_{X_1}} \tag{47}$$

Therefore, given any F_{X_2} with at most two points of increase, $F_{X_1}^*$ has at most three mass points.

When $\lambda = 1$, the term with summation in (47) disappears, which means that $\mathscr{F}_1$ could be replaced by

$$\left\{ F_{X_1} \in \mathscr{S}_1 | \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p(0|x_1) dF_{X_1}(x_1) = \tilde{p}_0^* \right\},$$

where $\tilde{p}_0^* = p_Y(0; F_{X_1}^* F_{X_2})$ is the probability of the event $Y = 0$, which is induced by $F_{X_1}^*$ and the given F_{X_2}. Since the number of intersecting hyperplanes has been reduced to one, it is concluded that $F_{X_1}^*$ has at most two points of increase. □

Remark 4. Note that the order of showing the discreteness of the supports is also important. First, for a given bounded F_{X_1} (not necessarily discrete), it is proved that $F_{X_2}^*$ is discrete with at most two mass points. Then, for a given discrete F_{X_2} with at most two mass points, it is shown that $F_{X_1}^*$ is also discrete with at most three mass points when $\lambda < 1$, and at most two mass points when $\lambda = 1$. When $\lambda > 1$, the order is reversed and it follows the same steps as in the case of $\lambda < 1$. Therefore, it is omitted.

Remark 5. (Settling a conjecture) Consider a point-to-point real AWGN channel with a K-bin (i.e., $\log_2 K$-bit) ADC front end. While it is shown in [4] that the capacity-achieving input distribution for this channel (with input average power constraint) has at most $K+1$ mass points, the authors observed in their numerical results that K mass points are always sufficient to achieve the capacity. The authors left it as an open problem whether the $K+1$ can be further tightened to K points, or not. If the average power constraint, which is a linear function of its corresponding input distribution, is treated as an intersecting hyperplane, Dubins' theorem states that $K+1$ mass points is sufficient. A simple trick, as used in the proof of Theorem 1, is to take the average power constraint into the objective function, and take into account the uniqueness of the solution. This reduces the number of intersecting hyperplanes by one, and results in the sufficiency of K mass points. This is also the case for asymmetric quantizers (e.g. [13]), since this reduction of the number of hyperplanes does not rely on the structure of the quantizer. In conclusion, the number of mass points is not affected by any number of linear constraints (e.g. $\mathbb{E}[X^4] \leq K$, etc) in the optimization.

V. SUM CAPACITY

In this section, we focus on the sum capacity of a MAC in the presence of a one-bit ADC front end at the receiver. The sum capacity is given by

$$C_{\text{sum}} = \sup\ I(X_1, X_2; Y|U),$$

where the supremum is over $F_U F_{X_1|U} F_{X_2|U}$ ($|\mathcal{U}| \leq 5$), such that $\mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \leq P_j,\ j = 1, 2$. First, we consider this problem for a realization of the auxiliary random variable U. Let P_1' and P_2' be two arbitrary non-negative real numbers. We have

$$\sup_{\substack{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}:\\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2]\leq P_j',\ j=1,2}} I(X_1, X_2; Y) = \sup_{(\mu_1,\mu_2)\in[0,\sqrt{P_1'}]\times[0,\sqrt{P_2'}]} \sup_{\substack{F_{\tilde{X}}:\\ \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}]=\mu_1+\mu_2\\ \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}^2]\leq P_1'+P_2'+2\mu_1\mu_2}} I(\tilde{X}; Y) \tag{48}$$

$$\leq \sup_{0\leq\mu\leq\sqrt{P_1'}+\sqrt{P_2'}} \sup_{\substack{F_{\tilde{X}}:\\ \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}]=\mu\\ \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}^2]\leq P_1'+P_2'+\frac{\mu^2}{2}}} I(\tilde{X}; Y) \tag{49}$$

$$\leq \sup_{0\leq\mu\leq\sqrt{2P}} \sup_{\substack{F_{\tilde{X}}:\\ \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}]=\mu\\ \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}^2]\leq P+\frac{\mu^2}{2}}} I(\tilde{X}; Y) \tag{50}$$

where in (48), $\tilde{X} \triangleq X_1 + X_2$, $\mu_j \triangleq \mathbb{E}[X_j]$, $p_{Y|\tilde{X}}(0|\tilde{x}) = Q(\tilde{x})$, and the equality is due to the Markov chain $(X_1, X_2) \to \tilde{X} \to Y$, and the fact that $\tilde{X}$ is a function of the pair (X_1, X_2). In (49), $\mu \triangleq \mu_1 + \mu_2$ and it is obvious that $\mu_1\mu_2 \leq \frac{\mu^2}{4}$. Finally, (50) follows from the fact that $\sqrt{P_1'} + \sqrt{P_2'} \leq \sqrt{2P}$, where $P \triangleq P_1' + P_2'$. In a similar way to the proof of Theorem 1, for any given μ, the following supremum

$$\sup_{\substack{F_{\tilde{X}}:\\ \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}]=\mu\\ \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}^2]\leq P+\frac{\mu^2}{2}}} I(\tilde{X}; Y)$$

is achieved by a distribution with at most two mass points, i.e., the point $x_1 = \mu - \sqrt{\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}(P - \frac{\mu^2}{2})}$ with probability ρ and the point $x_2 = \mu + \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}(P - \frac{\mu^2}{2})}$ with probability $1-\rho$, for some $\rho \in [0, 1]$. Therefore, (50) is equivalent to

$$\sup_{0\leq\mu\leq\sqrt{2P}} \sup_{0\leq\rho\leq1} H_b\left(\rho Q\left(\mu - \sqrt{\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}(P - \frac{\mu^2}{2})}\right) + (1-\rho)Q\left(\mu + \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}(P - \frac{\mu^2}{2})}\right)\right)$$
$$- \rho H_b\left(Q\left(\mu - \sqrt{\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}(P - \frac{\mu^2}{2})}\right)\right) - (1-\rho)H_b\left(Q\left(\sqrt{\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}(P - \frac{\mu^2}{2})}\right)\right). \tag{51}$$

Figure 3 shows the objective function in (51) as a function of (ρ, μ). It can be verified that the maximum is achieved at $(\rho^*, \mu^*) = (\frac{1}{2}, 0)$, and the maximum is $1 - H_b\left(Q(\sqrt{P})\right)$. Hence, we have

$$\sup_{\substack{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}:\\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2]\leq P_j',\ j=1,2}} I(X_1, X_2; Y) \leq 1 - H_b\left(Q(\sqrt{P_1' + P_2'})\right),$$



Fig. 3: The objective function in (51) for $P = 1$.

or equivalently,

$$I(X_1, X_2; Y|U = u) \leq 1 - H_b\left(Q\left(\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[X_1^2|u] + \mathbb{E}[X_2^2|u]}\right)\right).$$

We can write

$$\begin{aligned} I(X_1, X_2; Y|U) &= \sum_{i=1}^{5} p_U(u_i) I(X_1, X_2; Y|U = u_i) \\ &\leq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{5} p_U(u_i) H_b\left(Q\left(\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[X_1^2|u_i] + \mathbb{E}[X_2^2|u_i]}\right)\right) \\ &\leq 1 - H_b\left(Q\left(\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[X_1^2] + \mathbb{E}[X_2^2]}\right)\right) \qquad (52) \\ &\leq 1 - H_b\left(Q(\sqrt{P_1 + P_2})\right), \qquad (53) \end{aligned}$$

where (52) is due to the fact that $H_b\left(Q(\sqrt{x+y})\right)$ is a convex function of (x, y).

The upper bound in (53) can be achieved by time division with power control as follows. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{0, 1\}$ and $p_U(0) = 1 - p_U(1) = \frac{P_1}{P_1+P_2}$. Also, let $F_{X_1|U}(x|1) = F_{X_2|U}(x|0) = s(x)$, where $s(\cdot)$ is the unit step function, and

$$F_{X_1|U}(x|0) = F_{X_2|U}(x|1) = \frac{1}{2}s(x + \sqrt{P_1 + P_2}) + \frac{1}{2}s(x - \sqrt{P_1 + P_2}).$$

With this choice of $F_U F_{X_1|U} F_{X_2|U}$, the upper bound in (53) is achieved. Therefore,

$$C_{\text{sum}} = 1 - H_b\left(Q(\sqrt{P_1 + P_2})\right). \tag{54}$$

VI. Conclusion

We have studied the capacity region of a two-transmitter Gaussian MAC under average input power constraints and one-bit ADC front end at the receiver. We have shown that an auxiliary random variable is necessary for characterizing the capacity region. We have derived an upper bound on the cardinality of this auxiliary variable, and proved that the distributions that achieve the boundary points of the capacity region are finite and discrete. Furthermore, time division with power control has been shown to achieve the sum capacity of this channel. Finally, we settled the conjecture of the sufficiency of K mass points in a point to point AWGN channel with a K-bin quantizer at the receiver.

Appendix A
Proof of Proposition 2

A. Concavity

When $0 < \lambda \leq 1$, we have

$$I_\lambda(F_{X_1} F_{X_2}) = \lambda H(Y) + (1-\lambda) H(Y|X_2) - H(Y|X_1, X_2). \tag{55}$$

For a given F_{X_1}, $H(Y)$ is a concave function of F_{X_2}, while $H(Y|X_2)$ and $H(Y|X_1, X_2)$ are linear in F_{X_2}. Therefore, I_λ is a concave function of F_{X_2}. For a given F_{X_2}, $H(Y)$ and $H(Y|X_2)$ are concave functions of F_{X_1}, while $H(Y|X_1, X_2)$ is linear in F_{X_1}. Since $(1-\lambda) \geq 0$, I_λ is a concave function of F_{X_1}. The same reasoning applies to the case $\lambda > 1$.

B. Continuity

When $\lambda \leq 1$, the continuity of the three terms on the right hand side of (55) is investigated. Let $\{F_{X_2,n}\}$ be a sequence of distributions which is weakly convergent[9] to F_{X_2}. For a given F_{X_1}, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{x_2 \to x_2^0} p(y; F_{X_1}|x_2) &= \lim_{x_2 \to x_2^0} \int Q(x_1 + x_2) dF_{X_1}(x_1) \\
&= \int \lim_{x_2 \to x_2^0} Q(x_1 + x_2) dF_{X_1}(x_1) \qquad (57) \\
&= p(y; F_{X_1}|x_2^0), \qquad (58)
\end{aligned}$$

[9]The weak convergence of $\{F_n\}$ to F (also shown as $F_n(x) \xrightarrow{w} F(x)$) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(x) dF_n(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(x) dF(x), \tag{56}$$

for all continuous and bounded functions $\psi(\cdot)$ on $\mathbb{R}$. Note that $F_n(x) \xrightarrow{w} F(x)$ if and only if $d_L(F_n, F) \to 0$.

where (57) is due to the fact that the U function can be dominated by 1, which is an absolutely integrable function over F_{X_1}. Therefore, $p(y;F_{X_1}|x_2)$ is continuous in x_2, and combined with the weak convergence of $\{F_{X_2,n}\}$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n\to\infty} p(y;F_{X_1}F_{X_2,n}) &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\int p(y;F_{X_1}|x_2)dF_{X_2,n}(x_2)\\ &= \int p(y;F_{X_1}|x_2)dF_{X_2}(x_2)\\ &= p(y;F_{X_1}F_{X_2}).\end{aligned}$$

This allows us to write

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} -\sum_{y=0}^{1} p(y;F_{X_1}F_{X_2,n})\log p(y;F_{X_1}F_{X_2,n}) = -\sum_{y=0}^{1} p(y;F_{X_1}F_{X_2})\log p(y;F_{X_1}F_{X_2}),$$

which proves the continuity of $H(Y)$ in F_{X_2}. $H(Y|X_2=x_2)$ is a bounded ($\in[0,1]$) continuous function of x_2, since it is a continuous function of $p(y;F_{X_1}|x_2)$, and the latter is continuous in x_2 (see (58)). Therefore,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int H(Y|X_2=x_2)dF_{X_2,n}(x_2) = \int H(Y|X_2=x_2)dF_{X_2}(x_2),$$

which proves the continuity of $H(Y|X_2)$ in F_{X_2}. In a similar way, it can be verified that $\int H(Y|X_1=x_1,X_2=x_2)dF_{X_1}(x_1)$ is a bounded and continuous function of x_2 which guarantees the continuity of $H(Y|X_1,X_2)$ in F_{X_2}. Therefore, for a given F_{X_1}, I_λ is a continuous function of F_{X_2}. Exchanging the roles of F_{X_1} and F_{X_2} and also the case $\lambda>1$ can be addressed similarly, and are omitted for the sake of brevity.

C. Weak Differentiability

For a given F_{X_1}, the weak derivative of I_λ at $F^0_{X_2}$ is given by

$$I'_\lambda(F_{X_1}F_{X_2})|_{F^0_{X_2}} = \lim_{\beta\to 0^+}\frac{I_\lambda(F_{X_1}((1-\beta)F^0_{X_2}+\beta F_{X_2}))-I_\lambda(F_{X_1}F^0_{X_2})}{\beta}, \tag{59}$$

if the limit exists. It can be verified that

$$\begin{aligned}I'_\lambda(F_{X_1}F_{X_2})|_{F^0_{X_2}} &= \lim_{\beta\to 0^+}\frac{\int i_\lambda(x_2;(1-\beta)F^0_{X_2}+\beta F_{X_2}|F_{X_1})d((1-\beta)F^0_{X_2}(x_2)+\beta F_{X_2}(x_2))-\int i_\lambda(x_2;F^0_{X_2}|F_{X_1})dF^0_{X_2}(x_2)}{\beta}\\ &= \int i_\lambda(x_2;F^0_{X_2}|F_{X_1})dF_{X_2}(x_2)-\int i_\lambda(x_2;F^0_{X_2}|F_{X_1})dF^0_{X_2}(x_2)\\ &= \int i_\lambda(x_2;F^0_{X_2}|F_{X_1})dF_{X_2}(x_2)-I_\lambda(F_{X_1}F^0_{X_2}),\end{aligned}$$

where i_λ has been defined in (21). In a similar way, for a given F_{X_2}, the weak derivative of I_λ at $F^0_{X_1}$ is

$$I'_\lambda(F_{X_1}F_{X_2})|_{F^0_{X_1}} = \int \tilde{i}_\lambda(x_1;F^0_{X_1}|F_{X_2})dF_{X_1}(x_1)-I_\lambda(F^0_{X_1}F_{X_2}),$$

where $\tilde{i}_\lambda$ has been defined in (20). The case $\lambda>1$ can be addressed similarly.

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF LEMMA 1

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\substack{F_{X_1}:\\ \mathbb{E}[X_1^2]\le P_1'}} I_\lambda(F_{X_1}F_{X_2}) &\le \sup_{\substack{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}:\\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2]\le P_j',\ j=1,2}} I_\lambda(F_{X_1}F_{X_2}) \\
&\le \sup_{\substack{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}:\\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2]\le P_j',\ j=1,2}} I(X_1,X_2;Y) && (60)\\
&\le \sup_{\substack{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}:\\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2]\le P_j',\ j=1,2}} H(Y) - \inf_{\substack{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}:\\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2]\le P_j',\ j=1,2}} H(Y|X_1,X_2) \\
&= 1 - \inf_{\substack{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}:\\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2]\le P_j',\ j=1,2}} \iint H_b\left(Q(x_1+x_2)\right) dF_{X_1}(x_1)dF_{X_2}(x_2) \\
&= 1 - \inf_{\substack{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}:\\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2]\le P_j',\ j=1,2}} \iint H_b\left(Q\left(\sqrt{x_1^2}+\sqrt{x_2^2}\right)\right) dF_{X_1}(x_1)dF_{X_2}(x_2) && (61)\\
&\le 1 - \inf_{\substack{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}:\\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2]\le P_j',\ j=1,2}} \iint Q\left(\sqrt{x_1^2}+\sqrt{x_2^2}\right) dF_{X_1}(x_1)dF_{X_2}(x_2) && (62)\\
&= 1 - Q\left(\sqrt{P_1'}+\sqrt{P_2'}\right) && (63)\\
&< 1, && (64)
\end{aligned}$$

where (60) is from the assumption that $0 < \lambda \le 1$; (61) is justified by the fact that since the U function is monotonically decreasing and the sign of the inputs does not affect the average power constraints, X_1 and X_2 can be assumed non-negative (or alternatively non-positive) without loss of optimality; in (62), we use the fact that $Q\left(\sqrt{x_1^2}+\sqrt{x_2^2}\right) \le \frac{1}{2}$, and for $t \in [0,\frac{1}{2}]$, $H_b(t) \ge t$; (63) is based on the convexity and monotonicity of the function $Q(\sqrt{u}+\sqrt{v})$ in (u,v), which is shown in Appendix D. Therefore, the left hand side of (17) is strictly lower than 1.

Since X_2 has a finite second moment ($\mathbb{E}[X_2^2] \le P_2'$), from Chebyshev inequality, we have

$$P(|X_2| \ge M) \le \frac{P_2'}{M^2}, \quad \forall M > 0. \tag{65}$$

Fix $M > 0$ and consider $X_1 \sim F_{X_1}(x_1) = \frac{1}{2}[s(x_1+2M) + s(x_1-2M)]$. By this choice of F_{X_1}, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I_\lambda(F_{X_1}F_{X_2}) &= I(X_1;Y|X_2) + \lambda I(X_2;Y) \\
&\ge I(X_1;Y|X_2) \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} I(X_1;Y|X_2=x_2) dF_{X_2}(x_2) \\
&\ge \int_{-M}^{+M} I(X_1;Y|X_2=x_2) dF_{X_2}(x_2) && (66)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \inf_{F_{X_2}} \int_{-M}^{+M} H(Y|X_2 = x_2) dF_{X_2}(x_2) - \sup_{F_{X_2}} \int_{-M}^{+M} H(Y|X_1, X_2 = x_2) dF_{X_2}(x_2)$$

$$\geq \left(1 - \frac{P_2'}{M^2}\right) H_b\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}(Q(3M) + Q(M))\right) - H_b\left(Q(2M)\right), \tag{67}$$

where (67) is due to the fact that $H(Y|X_2 = x_2) = H_b(\frac{1}{2}Q(2M + x_2) + \frac{1}{2}Q(-2M + x_2))$ is minimized over $[-M, M]$ at $x_2 = M$ (or, alternatively at $x_2 = -M$), and $H(Y|X_1, X_2 = x_2) = \frac{1}{2}H_b(Q(2M + x_2)) + \frac{1}{2}H_b(Q(-2M + x_2))$ is maximized at $x_2 = 0$. (67) shows that I_λ (≤ 1) can become arbitrarily close to 1 given that M is large enough. Hence, its supremum over all distributions F_{X_1} is 1. This means that (17) cannot hold, and $\theta_1 \neq 0$.

APPENDIX C
PROOF OF LEMMA 2

(24) is obtained as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|D(p(y|x_1, x_2)||p(y; F_{X_1}F_{X_2}))\right| &= \left|\sum_{y=0}^{1} p(y|x_1, x_2) \log \frac{p(y|x_1, x_2)}{p(y; F_{X_1}F_{X_2})}\right| \\
&\leq \left|H(Y|X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2)\right| + \left|\sum_{y=0}^{1} p(y|x_1, x_2) \log p(y; F_{X_1}F_{X_2})\right| \\
&\leq 1 + \left|\sum_{y=0}^{1} \log p(y; F_{X_1}F_{X_2})\right| \qquad (68) \\
&= 1 - \sum_{y=0}^{1} \log p(y; F_{X_1}F_{X_2}) \\
&\leq 1 - 2\min\left\{\log p_Y(0; F_{X_1}F_{X_2}), \log p_Y(1; F_{X_1}F_{X_2})\right\} \\
&\leq 1 - 2\log Q(\sqrt{P_1'} + \sqrt{P_2'}) \qquad (69) \\
&< \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where (68) is due to the fact that the binary entropy function is upper bounded by 1. (69) is justified as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\min\left\{p_Y(0; F_{X_1}F_{X_2}), p_Y(1; F_{X_1}F_{X_2})\right\} &\geq \inf_{\substack{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}: \\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \leq P_j'}} \min\left\{p_Y(0; F_{X_1}F_{X_2}), p_Y(1; F_{X_1}F_{X_2})\right\} \\
&= \inf_{\substack{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}: \\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \leq P_j'}} p_Y(0; F_{X_1}F_{X_2}) \\
&= \inf_{\substack{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}: \\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \leq P_j'}} \iint Q(x_1 + x_2) dF_{X_1}(x_1) dF_{X_2}(x_2) \\
&= \inf_{\substack{F_{X_1}F_{X_2}: \\ \mathbb{E}[X_j^2] \leq P_j'}} \iint Q\left(\sqrt{x_1^2} + \sqrt{x_2^2}\right) dF_{X_1}(x_1) dF_{X_2}(x_2) \qquad (70) \\
&\geq Q\left(\sqrt{P_1'} + \sqrt{P_2'}\right), \qquad (71)
\end{aligned}$$

where (71) is based on the convexity and monotonicity of the function $Q(\sqrt{u}+\sqrt{v})$, which is shown in appendix D.

(25) is obtained as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} p(y;F_{X_1}|x_2) &\geq \min\left\{p(0;F_{X_1}|x_2), p(1;F_{X_1}|x_2)\right\} \\ &\geq \int Q\left(|x_1|+|x_2|\right) dF_{X_1}(x_1) \\ &= \int Q\left(\sqrt{x_1^2}+|x_2|\right) dF_{X_1}(x_1) \\ &\geq Q\left(\sqrt{P_1'}+|x_2|\right), \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

where (72) is due to convexity of $Q(\alpha+\sqrt{x})$ in x for $\alpha \geq 0$.

(26) is obtained as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left|\sum_{y=0}^{1} p(y|x_1,x_2)\log\frac{p(y;F_{X_1}F_{X_2})}{p(y;F_{X_1}|x_2)}\right| dF_{X_2}(x_2) &\leq -\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\sum_{y=0}^{1}\log p(y;F_{X_1}|x_2)dF_{X_2}(x_2) \\ &\leq -2\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\log Q\left(\sqrt{P_1'}+|x_2|\right) dF_{X_2}(x_2) \qquad (73) \\ &= -2\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\log Q\left(\sqrt{P_1'}+\sqrt{x_2^2}\right) dF_{X_2}(x_2) \\ &\leq -2\log Q\left(\sqrt{P_1'}+\sqrt{P_2'}\right) \qquad (74) \\ &< +\infty \qquad (75) \end{aligned}$$

where (87) is from (72) and (74) is due to concavity of $-\log Q(\alpha+\sqrt{x})$ in x for $\alpha \geq 0$ as shown in Appendix D.

APPENDIX D
TWO CONVEX FUNCTIONS

Let $f(x) = \log Q(a+\sqrt{x})$ for $x, a \geq 0$. We have,

$$f'(x) = -\frac{e^{-\frac{(a+\sqrt{x})^2}{2}}}{2\sqrt{2\pi x}Q(a+\sqrt{x})},$$

and

$$f''(x) = \frac{e^{-\frac{(a+\sqrt{x})^2}{2}}}{4x\sqrt{2\pi}U^2(a+\sqrt{x})}\left((a+\sqrt{x}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{x}})Q(a+\sqrt{x}) - \phi(a+\sqrt{x})\right), \tag{76}$$

where $\phi(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{u^2}{2}}$. Not that

$$\begin{aligned} (1+at+t^2)Q(a+t) + a\phi(a+t) &> \left(1+(a+t)^2\right)Q(a+t) \qquad (77) \\ &> (a+t)\phi(a+t), \quad \forall a,t>0, \qquad (78) \end{aligned}$$

where (77) and (78) are, respectively, due to $\phi(x) > xQ(x)$ and $(1+x^2)Q(x) > x\phi(x)$ $(x>0)$. Therefore,

$$(a+\sqrt{x}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{x}})Q(a+\sqrt{x}) > \phi(a+\sqrt{x}),$$

which makes the second derivative in (76) positive and proves the (strict) convexity of $f(x)$.



Fig. 4: The figure depicting (82) and (84). Note that in the statement of lemma 4, $x_2 \to +\infty$. Hence, we have assumed $x_2 > A$ in the figure.

Let $f(u,v) = Q(\sqrt{u}+\sqrt{v})$ for $u, v \geq 0$. By simple differentiation, the Hessian matrix of f is

$$\mathbf{H} = \frac{e^{-\frac{(\sqrt{u}+\sqrt{v})^2}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2u\sqrt{u}} + \frac{\sqrt{u}+\sqrt{v}}{4u} & \frac{\sqrt{u}+\sqrt{v}}{4\sqrt{u}\sqrt{v}} \\ \frac{\sqrt{u}+\sqrt{v}}{4\sqrt{u}\sqrt{v}} & \frac{1}{2v\sqrt{v}} + \frac{\sqrt{u}+\sqrt{v}}{4v} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{79}$$

It can be verified that $\det(\mathbf{H}) > 0$ and $\text{trace}(\mathbf{H}) > 0$. Therefore, both the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{H}$ are positive, which makes the matrix positive definite. Hence, $Q(\sqrt{u}+\sqrt{v})$ is (strictly) convex in (u,v).

Appendix E
Proof of Lemma 4

Let $A \triangleq \max\{A_1, A_2\}$. It is obvious that

$$Q(x_2+A) \leq \int_{-A}^{A} Q(x_1+x_2)dF_{X_1}(x_1) \leq Q(x_2-A). \tag{80}$$

Therefore, we can write

$$\int_{-A}^{A} Q(x_1+x_2)dF_{X_1}(x_1) = \beta Q(x_2+A) + (1-\beta)Q(x_2-A), \tag{81}$$

for some $\beta \in [0,1]$. Note that β is a function of x_2. Also, due to concavity of $H_b(\cdot)$, we have

$$H_b\left(\int_{-A}^{A} Q(x_1+x_2)dF_{X_1}(x_1)\right) \geq \int_{-A}^{A} H_b(Q(x_1+x_2))dF_{X_1}(x_1). \tag{82}$$

From the fact that

$$H_b(x) \geq \frac{H_b(p)-H_b(a)}{p-a}(x-a) + H_b(a), \ \forall x \in [a,p], \ \forall a,p \in [0,1](a<p), \tag{83}$$

we can also write

$$\int_{-A}^{A} H_b(Q(x_1+x_2))dF_{X_1}(x_1) \geq \frac{H_b(Q(x_2-A))-H_b(Q(x_2+A))}{Q(x_2-A)-Q(x_2+A)}\left(\int_{-A}^{A} Q(x_1+x_2)dF_{X_1}(x_1)-Q(x_2+A)\right)$$
$$+H_b(Q(x_2+A))$$
$$= \beta H_b(Q(x_2+A)) + (1-\beta)H_b(Q(x_2-A)), \tag{84}$$

where (83) and (81) have been used in (84), respectively. (82) and (84) are depicted in Figure 4.

From (81) and (84), we have

$$\frac{\beta H_b(Q(x_2+A)) + (1-\beta)H_b(Q(x_2-A))}{H_b\Big(\beta Q(x_2+A)+(1-\beta)Q(x_2-A)\Big)} \leq \frac{\int_{-A}^{A} H_b(Q(x_1+x_2))dF_{X_1}(x_1)}{H_b\Big(\int_{-A}^{A} Q(x_1+x_2)dF_{X_1}(x_1)\Big)} \leq 1. \tag{85}$$

Let

$$\beta^* \triangleq \arg\min_{\beta} \frac{\beta H_b(Q(x_2+A)) + (1-\beta)H_b(Q(x_2-A))}{H_b\Big(\beta Q(x_2+A)+(1-\beta)Q(x_2-A)\Big)}. \tag{86}$$

This minimizer satisfies the following equality

$$\frac{d}{d\beta}\left(\frac{\beta H_b(Q(x_2+A)) + (1-\beta)H_b(Q(x_2-A))}{H_b\Big(\beta Q(x_2+A)+(1-\beta)Q(x_2-A)\Big)}\right)\Bigg|_{\beta=\beta^*} = 0. \tag{87}$$

Therefore, we can write

$$\frac{\beta H_b(Q(x_2+A)) + (1-\beta)H_b(Q(x_2-A))}{H_b\Big(\beta Q(x_2+A)+(1-\beta)Q(x_2-A)\Big)} \geq \frac{\beta^* H_b(Q(x_2+A)) + (1-\beta^*)H_b(Q(x_2-A))}{H_b\Big(\beta^* Q(x_2+A)+(1-\beta^*)Q(x_2-A)\Big)} \tag{88}$$
$$= \frac{\frac{H_b(Q(x_2-A))-H_b(Q(x_2+A))}{Q(x_2-A)-Q(x_2+A)}}{H_b'\Big(\beta^* Q(x_2+A)+(1-\beta^*)Q(x_2-A)\Big)} \tag{89}$$
$$\geq \frac{\frac{H_b(Q(x_2-A))-H_b(Q(x_2+A))}{Q(x_2-A)-Q(x_2+A)}}{H_b'(Q(x_2+A))}, \tag{90}$$

where (88) is from the definition in (86); (89) is from the expansion of (87), and $H_b'(t) = \log(\frac{1-t}{t})$ is the derivative of the binary entropy function; (90) is due to the fact that $H_b'(t)$ is a decreasing function.

Applying L'hospital's rule multiple times, we obtain

$$\lim_{x_2\to+\infty} \frac{\frac{H_b(Q(x_2-A))-H_b(Q(x_2+A))}{Q(x_2-A)-Q(x_2+A)}}{H_b'(Q(x_2+A))} = \lim_{x_2\to+\infty} \frac{H_b(Q(x_2-A))\Big(1-\frac{H_b(Q(x_2+A))}{H_b(Q(x_2-A))}\Big)}{Q(x_2-A)\Big(1-\frac{Q(x_2+A)}{Q(x_2-A)}\Big)\log(\frac{1-Q(x_2+A)}{Q(x_2+A)})}$$
$$= \lim_{x_2\to+\infty} -\frac{H_b(Q(x_2-A))}{Q(x_2-A)\log(Q(x_2+A))}$$
$$= \lim_{x_2\to+\infty} \frac{e^{-\frac{(x_2-A)^2}{2}}\log(Q(x_2-A))}{e^{-\frac{(x_2-A)^2}{2}}\log(Q(x_2+A)) + \frac{Q(x_2-A)}{Q(x_2+A)}e^{-\frac{(x_2+A)^2}{2}}}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{x_2 \to +\infty} \frac{\log(Q(x_2 - A))}{\log(Q(x_2 + A)) + 1} \\
&= \lim_{x_2 \to +\infty} \frac{Q(x_2 + A)e^{Ax}}{Q(x_2 - A)e^{-Ax}} \\
&= 1 \qquad (91)
\end{aligned}
$$

From (85), (90) and (91), (36) is proved. Note that the boundedness of X_1 is crucial in the proof. In other words, the fact that $Q(x_2 - A) \to 0$ as $x_2 \to +\infty$ is the very result of $A < +\infty$.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Walden, "Analog-to-digital converter survey and analysis," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Comm.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 539–550, Apr. 1999.

[2] B. Murmann, "ADC performance survey," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1404.7736, 1997-2014. [Online]. Available: http://web.stanford.edu/~murmann/adcsurvey.html

[3] D. Gunduz, K. Stamatiou, N. Michelusi, and M. Zorzi, "Designing intelligent energy harvesting communication systems," *IEEE Comm. Magazine*, vol. 52, pp. 210–216, January 2014.

[4] J. Singh, O. Dabeer, and U. Madhow, "On the limits of communication with low-precision analog-to-digital conversion at the receiver," *IEEE Trans. Communications*, vol. 57, no. 12, pp. 3629–3639, December 2009.

[5] S. Krone and G. Fettweis, "Fading channels with 1-bit output quantization: Optimal modulation, ergodic capacity and outage probability," in *Proc. IEEE Inf. Theory Workshop (ITW)*, Aug. 2010, pp. 1–5.

[6] A. Mezghani and J. Nossek, "Analysis of Rayleigh-fading channels with 1-bit quantized output," *IEEE Int. Sym. Inf. Theory*, pp. 260–264, Jul. 2008.

[7] ——, "On ultra-wideband MIMO systems with 1-bit quantized outputs: Performance analysis and input optimization," *IEEE Int. Sym. Inf. Theory*, pp. 1286–1289, Jun. 2007.

[8] J. Mo and R. Heath, "Capacity analysis of one-bit quantized MIMO systems with transmitter channel state information," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Processing*, vol. 63, no. 20, pp. 5498–5512, Oct. 2015.

[9] A. E. Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, *Network Information Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.

[10] H. Witsenhausen, "Some aspects of convexity useful in information theory," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 265–271, May 1980.

[11] I. Abou-Faycal, M. Trott, and S. Shamai, "The capacity of discrete-time memoryless Rayleigh-fading channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 1290–1300, May 2001.

[12] W. Rudin, *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*. McGraw-Hill, 1976.

[13] T. Koch and A. Lapidoth, "At low SNR, asymmetric quantizers are better," *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory*, vol. 59, no. 9, pp. 5498–5512, Sep. 2013.